

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in response to the Office action mailed April 1, 2008. Claims 1, 7 and 11 have been amended. Claim 2 has been canceled without prejudice. In addition, new claims 12-15 have been added. The amendments are sourced from the original specification and/or drawings of the present application, and no new matter is added. Claims 1 and 3-15 are pending in the application.

Applicant appreciates Examiner's careful review and consideration of the present application.

Priority

The Examiner is thanked for acknowledging the foreign priority based on an application filed in Taiwan on March 12, 2003. In the response to this Office Action, applicant respectfully holds this requirement in abeyance and will submit a certified copy of the foreign application, TAIWAN 92105298, upon receiving a Notice of Allowance.

Double Patenting

Claims 1-11 were rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent No. 7,337,178 (hereinafter referred to as referenced U.S. Patent).

In response, Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses as follows:

Comparing amended claim 1 of the present application with the referenced U.S. Patent, applicant submits that amended claim 1 of the present application provides a system for **monitoring imports and exports**, and claim 1 of the referenced U.S. Patent provides a system for **posting records in customs**.

Furthermore, applicant acknowledges that amended claim 1 of the present application and the referenced U.S. Patent both recite an enterprise server. It is

submitted that the enterprise server of amended claim 1 of the present application comprising a data maintaining module, an auditing module, and a bill of entry generating module, however, the enterprise server of claim 1 of the referenced U.S. Patent comprises an information maintaining module, a records posting module, and a customs data synchronizing module.

In particular, amended claim 1 of the present application recites how to audit import and export materials based on the current stock of each material, the safe threshold volume of each material, and the consumption quantity per unit finished product, and recites how to generate bills of entry based on the audited information on import and export materials, and transmit the bills of entry to the customs server. However, claim 1 of the referenced U.S. Patent recites how to generate the records for posting in customs according to the information on the enterprise, the contracts and the materials, transmit the records to the customs server, and store the records in a database, and recites how to synchronize customs information based on the content of feedback on the records received from the customs server, and update the records accordingly.

In addition, Applicant asserts that amended claim 1 of the present application provides the limitation of “*adding and modifying a relevant file transfer protocol, communication, and dial-up information on the system*”. Such limitation is not recited in claims 1-4 of the referenced U.S. Patent.

Accordingly, the claimed subject matter of amended claim 1 of the present application is patentably distinct from the claimed subject matter, as recited in claim 1 of the referenced U.S. Patent.

Similarly, amended claim 7 of the present application provides a method for **monitoring imports and exports**, and claim 5 of the referenced U.S. Patent provides a method for **posting records in customs**. For at least reasons similar and corresponding to those submitted above in relation to claim 1, Applicant submits that the claimed subject matter of amended claim 7 of the present application is patentably distinct from the claimed subject matter of claim 5 of the referenced U.S. Patent.

In conclusion, the subject matter claimed in the present application is patentably different from the subject matter claimed in the referenced U.S. Patent, and both applications do not claim common subject matter. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 1-11 of the present application are patentable over claims 1-12 of the referenced U.S. Patent. Reconsideration and removal of the double patenting rejection of claims 1-11 are requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

I. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 8 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manucha et al. (PGPub US 2003/0115072 A1, hereinafter referred to as Manucha) in view of Chen (PGPub US 2003/0154143 A1).

II. Claims 5, 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manucha in view of Chen, and further in view of Official Notice.

In response to this rejection, Applicant has amended claims 1, 7 and 11 by including more limitations therein. Support for the amended subject matter can be found in at least paragraphs [0014] and [0020] of the originally filed specification of the present application. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejected claims are now patentable, as follows:

Claims 1-6

Claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

“a system configuring module for ***adding and modifying a relevant file transfer protocol, communication, and dial-up information on the system;***

a data maintaining module for adding, modifying, inquiring and deleting information on import and export materials and stock; [and]

an auditing module for auditing import and export materials based on a current stock of each material, a safe threshold volume of each material, and a consumption quantity per unit finished product, ***the auditing of the import materials being to ensure that the import quantity of each raw material together***

with the quantity of the current stock does not exceed the safe threshold volume of the raw material, the auditing of export quantities of finished products being to ensure that the consumption quantity per unit finished product corresponding to each raw material does not exceed the quantity of the current stock of the raw material’.

Applicant submits that neither Manucha nor Chen, taken alone or in combination, teaches or otherwise suggests the invention having the above-highlighted features as set forth in amended claim 1.

Manucha, on page 2, paragraph [0014], discloses an integrated import/export system that includes a database of records relating to a plurality of shipments of goods. In particular, each record has information relating to at least a first jurisdiction and a second jurisdiction. An application server communicates with a database server for providing a user interface. The interface allows each member to modify a portion of a record relating to one of plurality of shipments of goods.

Applicant acknowledges that Manucha discloses a feature of “modifying a portion of a record”. However, Manucha fails to teach or suggest ***adding and modifying a relevant file transfer protocol, communication, and dial-up information***, as claimed in amended claim 1.

Furthermore, Manucha, on page 4, paragraph [0041], discloses an “Application server 206, included in IIES application 306, takes requests from the web server 208 and processes them and returns the result back to the web server 208. The requests are usually data manipulation requests and it will closely interact with the Database Server 204. Application server 206 will also process and format the web pages prior to returning them back to the web server 208 performing functions that the web server 208 cannot do itself due to inherent web server limitations”.

Obviously, Manucha fails to teach or suggest *how* to audit import and export materials and *the criteria* to audit import and export materials. However, claim 1 of the present application provides detailed limitations about *how* to audit import and export

materials and *the criteria* to audit import and export materials. Therefore, Applicant submits that Manucha fails to teach or suggest the feature of “***the auditing of the import materials being to ensure that the import quantity of each raw material together with the quantity of the current stock does not exceed the safe threshold volume of the raw material,***” and the feature of “***the auditing of export quantities of finished products being to ensure that the consumption quantity per unit finished product corresponding to each raw material does not exceed the quantity of the current stock of the raw material,***” as claimed in amended claim 1.

In addition, Chen does disclose a system for monitoring imported and exported goods. According to Chen, the inventory module is for accessing the database for information on finished goods, usage of materials and current inventory (FIG. 4). However, Chen fails to teach or suggest *auditing import and export materials based on the current stock of each material, the safe threshold volume of each material, and the consumption quantity per unit finished product*. Particularly, Chen also fails to teach or suggest the features of “***the auditing of the import materials being to ensure that the import quantity of each raw material together with the quantity of the current stock does not exceed the safe threshold volume of the raw material, the auditing of export quantities of finished products being to ensure that the consumption quantity per unit finished product corresponding to each raw material does not exceed the quantity of the current stock of the raw material,***” as claimed in amended claim 1. Further, Applicant asserts that any combination of Manucha and Chen fails to teach or suggest the above-highlighted features either.

In conclusion, applicant submits that neither Manucha nor Chen, provides any teaching, suggestion, or motivation that it could be combined with the other to yield the inventive system as currently set forth in claim 1, as amended. That is, amended claim 1 is unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Manucha in view of Chen. Applicant requests reconsideration and removal of the rejection and allowance of the claim.

Since applicant has canceled claim 2 without prejudice, the rejection relating thereto is now moot.

Claims 3-6 and new claims 12-13 depend from independent claim 1, and respectively recite additional subject matter. Therefore, claims 3-6 and 12-13 should also be allowable.

Claims 7-10

Claim 7, as amended, recites in part:

***“adding and modifying a relevant file transfer protocol, communication, and dial-up information on the system; [and]
auditing the information on import and export materials based on the current stock of each material, the safe threshold volume of each material, and the consumption quantity per unit finished product corresponding to each raw material, **the auditing of the import materials being to ensure that the import quantity of each raw material together with the quantity of the current stock does not exceed the safe threshold volume of the raw material, the auditing of export quantities of finished products being to ensure that the consumption quantity per unit finished product corresponding to each raw material does not exceed the quantity of the current stock of the raw material**”.***

Amended claim 7 is a method claim corresponding to the system for declaration of monitoring imports and exports of amended claim 1. Referring to and incorporating herein the above-asserted reasons regarding the patentability of amended claim 1, applicant submits that neither Manucha nor Chen, taken alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests the present invention having the above-highlighted limitations as set forth in amended claim 7. Accordingly, amended claim 7 is unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Manucha in view of Chen.

Reconsideration and removal of the rejection and allowance of amended claim 7 are requested.

Claims 8-10 and new claims 14-15 depend from amended independent claim 7, and respectively recite additional subject matter. Thus, claims 8-10 and 14-15 should also be allowable.

Claim 11

Amended claim 11 recites a method for monitoring imports and exports which is similar to the method as recited in amended claim 7. For at least reasons similar and corresponding to those asserted above in relation to claim 7, applicant submits that neither Manucha nor Chen, taken alone or in combination, teaches or otherwise suggests the method as currently set forth in claim 11. That is, claim 11 is unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Manucha in view of Chen. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection and allowance of claim 11 are requested.

Appl. No. 10/799,149
Amdt. Dated June 25, 2008
Reply to Office Action Mailed April 1, 2008

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that the foregoing Amendment and Response place this application in condition for allowance. If Examiner believes that there are any issues that can be resolved by a telephone conference, or that there are any informalities that can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, please call the undersigned at 714.626.1224.

Respectfully submitted,
Fenghua Zhou

By /Frank R. Niranjana/ Date: June 25, 2008

Frank R. Niranjana

Registration No.: 41,572

Please recognize the application with Customer No. 25,859

Foxconn International, Inc.

P.O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive, Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel No.: (714) 626-1224

Fax No.: (714) 738-4649